UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Great Historical Boomerang - - - - - - - - *Stanton A. Coblentz*

What the Church Can Do - *Edmund A. Opitz*

Life Under the Reich - *O. A. Hammand*

Post-War World: Public Enemy No. 1 - - - - - - - - - *Robert S. Hoagland*

Western Unitarian Conference News

VOLUME CXXX NUMBER 4

Chicago, June, 1944

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

Karl M. Chworowsky: Minister of the Fourth Unitarian Congregational Church in Brooklyn, New York.

Stanton A. Coblentz: Well-known journalist and author.

O. A. Hammand: Attorney and free lance journalist.

Robert S. Hoagland: Minister of the Unitarian Society of Fort Wayne, Indiana.

Edmund A. Opitz: Minister of The Unitarian Church of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES..... 51
Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES..... 54

ARTICLES —

The Great Historical Boomerang—STANTON A. COBLENTZ..... 54
What the Church Can Do—EDMUND A. OPITZ..... 56
Life Under the Reich—O. A. HAMMAND..... 57
Post-War World: Public Enemy No. 1—ROBERT S. HOAGLAND.. 59

POETRY—

Call to Arms!—LEE SPENCER..... 53

THE STUDY TABLE—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY..... 60

CORRESPONDENCE—

Too Much Militarism—BRENT DOW ALLINSON..... 63
Too Much Pacifism:
STERLING RUSSELL
MRS. JOSEPH ROBINS 63

WESTERN UNITARIAN CONFERENCE NEWS..... 64

THE FIELD—

Invasion — *Friends Intelligencer* 50

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Invasion

We have become accustomed to think of the invasion as a military event of decisive and lasting consequences. But we ought also to think of it and of any war action as a huge invasion into the spheres of normal life. This particular invasion will be only one phase of a slow but inexorable break with the past, but it is no exaggeration to say that it, as well as all that has gone on so far in the war, is going to affect every one of us in all conditions of life. . . .

Years before the actual outbreak of the war we sensed its coming. It was slowly creeping up on us like poison gas. And so is peace now advancing, slowly and without the heralding trumpet signals of victory but with the sad symbols of suffering and marks of the high price that must be paid. Already now we are discharging almost 100,000 soldiers per month, and of these no less than 10,000 are emotionally or mentally no longer fit for duty. We shall have to expect much larger figures of this kind for the rest of the duration.

The Surgeon General of the United States Army has released a statement for the general public concerning the attitude to be taken toward these men and women. These simple and wise rules, entitled "When One Meets an Injured Man," advise self-discipline upon meeting a maimed or disfigured person. We should assume a natural and if possible a casual attitude when dealing with them, omitting all hints, advice, and questions. We must not be sentimental or overcheery or oversolicitous, but merely (merely!) realistic. By putting a quiet trust in the injured person's ability to manage life without our assistance we may help him best. All we can do to assist him is to let him help himself. . . .

That is also true for those who come home without any physical injury. Frustration, feelings of guilt, an undercurrent of resentment, restlessness, and abruptly appearing queer traits will disturb them and will worry us. . . . Many of the returning men will be critical of our religious life—skeptical or even cynical. This situation will be general and all religious bodies must cope with it. . . .

Never before has such a large group of Friends been in the armed forces as is the case this time. This fact alone signalizes a unique historic change, an invasion of a new and harsh reality into a well-guarded and secure community life. If there ever was a Quaker who thought that we had nothing to do with war but to plead for brotherhood and feed the hungry afterwards, he will experience a rude awakening. Our much cherished "way of life" will be severely tested in the time to come, and we shall have to respond to very specific and urgent demands. At this moment when terrible sufferings are about to break upon millions of Europeans and upon our own soldiers too we shall have to realize that the invasion already has become a burdensome and lasting reality for all of us. . . . The one contribution we can and *must* make today to this future is to orient our thinking in a forward direction—*now and definitely.*

—Editorial from *Friends Intelligencer.*

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXX JUNE, 1944 No. 4

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

There was naturally a feeling of relief when Gandhi was released from prison last month—relief for the Mahatma, and relief also for the Allied cause which has been so terribly embarrassed by a denial of liberty which matched so direfully the Nazi oppressions. But I see no reason why, in the broader sense, there should be any elation over this event, least of all any gratitude to Britain. For there was not a particle of magnanimity or even justice in what the Empire did. For Gandhi was released not because it was wrong to hold him, but simply and solely because he was seriously ill, and the government had no desire to have him die on their hands. Had Gandhi been an inconspicuous Indian leader, he would have been left to die in jail, as many another obscure political prisoner has undoubtedly died. Had Gandhi been well and strong, he would still be in "durance vile" today. If Gandhi should suddenly recover, and resume his former activities on behalf of his country, he will be promptly rearrested and confined, we may be sure of that. More important than anything else is the fact that this release of the Mahatma indicates no slightest change of public policy on Britain's part. For while Gandhi in his enfeebled condition goes at large, thousands of other leaders of India's cause are still in prison. First among these leaders is Jawaharlal Nehru, the destined successor of Gandhi, and in his own right one of the outstanding statesmen of the world today. Imagine giving any praise to Britain for Gandhi's release, when such a man as Nehru is still imprisoned in India, as Niemöller is in Germany! No, it is the same old Empire that is on the job in the Far East. There is no suggestion anywhere that the Orient must be freed from an alien rule as intolerable to Asiatics as the rule of the Nazis is intolerable to Europeans. This is the dark cloud that lowers with menace of coming storm over all the horizon of our post-war world. For if East and West alike are not freed from tyranny, then a third world war is certain, and this war will be the last, so far at least as the Occident is concerned. So Gandhi stands, as he has so long stood, as a symbol—a symbol of the future of his nation, and of the destiny of all mankind. The prayers of us all must be for the Mahatma's speedy recovery. But the shame of an India bound and fettered still remains—and Gandhi is not free while his country and his people are in chains.

II

Mr. Paul Comly French, a well-known Quaker, had a recent letter to the editor in the *Friends Intelligencer*. In this letter, Mr. French wrote the following:

> I am convinced, from what I have observed in Washington during the past three and a half years, that few of those in authority have any solution to the problems of the world. Many are thinking of the post-war period, but most of them are thinking of planning in terms of materialistic solutions.

Here is authoritative confirmation of the general impression that Washington has long been pretty much of a mess, with little administrative control, or even understanding, of ideas and policies. But here also is an analysis of what is wrong, not only with Washington but also with the world at large. Why is it that we seem not to be getting anywhere in this war in the matter of saving mankind from the evils that have plunged it into ruin? There is dissension among the United Nations, no clear definition of war aims, no big and noble purpose, but rather petty pursuits of nationalistic advantage and military power. The trouble, as Mr. French points out, is that we are concerned these days with merely materialistic considerations. The farthest we go in our thought on post-war problems is in the direction of political setups and economic programs. Not a word about the spiritual realities of life, or the elementary principles of the moral law! This is fundamentally what got us into this war. "As far back as 1850," writes Dr. Paul Scherer, "our moral standards began to disintegrate," and we "lost God." But we did not care! We would build a world without God. And that is what we undertook to do—with the result that is all about us at the present moment! Yet we are now proceeding to do the same thing all over again. Apparently we have learned no lesson—among others, for example, that "where there is no vision the people perish." So darkness enshrouds us, and blind leaders of the blind, in Washington and elsewhere, carry us on to new confusions, and old disasters. Paul French is right—there is no salvation in "materialistic

solutions" of our problems. Hence the need for religious leadership! Says Mr. French: "Today offers the opportunity for Christians to show that they know a way of life that does away with the occasion for wars and that they have the moral and spiritual courage to follow it, regardless of the national imperatives of the moment."

III

It is comforting to be told by Herbert L. Matthews, in a special story in the *New York Times,* that henceforth every effort is to be made by the United Nations, in their prosecution of the war, to protect objects of rare historical and artistic value from unnecessary damage or destruction. But one wonders why it has taken nearly five years of the most ghastly fighting to awaken the so-called champions of civilization to this precaution. Mr. Matthews names some priceless churches in Italy which have been completely wrecked because no warning was given to the bombers to spare them—indeed, no information that they were there. The bombers, in other words, were just sent out to obliterate a target without regard to what the target might contain, as though every target in Italy was not certain to contain treasures that could never be replaced. Henceforth, we are told, such churches and other rare objects are to be clearly marked upon the maps, and instructions given to the bombers to avoid them. Which means that the irreparable ruin already spread abroad in Italy by our invasion could quite as well have been avoided! Monte Cassino has taught another lesson. Here was one of the most sacred spots in Europe, and we turned our guns upon it and pounded it into rubble. We did this, so it was announced, because Monte Cassino was being used by the Germans as a fortress. This was our assertion—it has not yet been proved! But now that the monastery has been destroyed, it has been found that the ruins became a fortress as nearly impregnable as can be imagined. In other words, we wiped out a priceless religious and cultural monument, with a military result that was a loss rather than a gain. Why did our commanders in the field not know this, and what is the chance that they will know it when they invade Holland, Belgium, and France, as they have invaded Italy? But conscience is evidently awake at last. The protests against obliteration bombing are having their effects. It is beginning to be understood that to reconquer from the Nazis a Europe which is destroyed in the process of reconquest and thus no longer exists, is hardly worth while. Also, it is beginning to be realized that, as Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick put it the other day, while posterity has largely forgotten the names of those who erected the great cathedrals, churches, monasteries, libraries, art galleries, and other treasures, this same posterity will never forget the names of those who destroyed them. So it is a good thing that at last, before final and complete ruin has been wrought upon the continent, due precautions are to be taken. But if precautions thus to save stones, books, and pictures from ruin, why not similar precautions to save people from death? The crowning horror and irreparable loss in obliteration bombing is the slaughter of the innocents. What will posterity do to those who make Europe a charnel house of burning corpses? It will make little distinction between Nazis and Allies, but brand them all as barbarians.

IV

The tendency to turn to the military for leadership in this crisis of the national life is alarming to say the least. This tendency had its most dramatic illustration in the movement for the nomination of General Douglas MacArthur for the presidency on the Republican ticket. The General, after the excellent example of his great predecessor, General Sherman, snuffed this out with commendable finality. There remains the movement to nominate General Marshall on the Democratic ticket if the President himself does not choose to run. Marshall should speak as decisively as MacArthur has done. For there is no place for the military in politics. In any true democracy, the civil power must at all times be kept supreme over the military. History shows that the military has again and again destroyed liberty—Caesar takes over Rome, the Man on Horseback rides down the people! The fact is a military man is not fitted either by training or experience, to serve as the political leader of a free state. For the soldier rules by the method of obedience, whereas the statesman leads by the method of persuasion. It may be well to remember that this nation has never yet, in time of war, chosen a soldier to be its president. We have had soldiers aplenty in the White House, and almost invariably have lived to regret it. The Grant episode was the crowning tragedy of this phase of our history! But in every case we have elected soldiers to the presidential office only after the wars in which they made their fame were over. Never once, while a war was being fought, have we taken a man in active service and planted him at the head of the civil administration. This would be a dangerous precedent, placing in hazard everything most precious in our national life. The same principle holds, by the way, in the matter of war ministers in relation to making peace after war. The more successful a man is in waging a war behind a civilian desk, the more unfitted is this man likely to be for the task of writing terms of peace. Clemenceau, one of the great war ministers of all time, was the central and most disastrous influence at Versailles. The conviction is getting deep-rooted in England that Churchill, immortal successor to his great ancestor, Marlborough, must be relieved of office when this war is done. Roosevelt's zest for war to the bitter end is doleful augury of any part that he may play in making peace. That is the irony of war! Its very success in operation is its own defeat in purpose.

V

It is a rather startling thing to learn that, in this era of vast prosperity, church support is steadily decreasing. I had had the notion that just the opposite was the case —that money was flowing freely into church coffers, that mortgages were being paid off, and so on. But statistics, which so often confound us, prove that this is not so. Thus in 1928 gifts to churches and church-related agencies amounted to $1,319,000,000, whereas in 1943 such gifts amounted to only $1,006,000,000. During this same period, our national income soared from $77,000,000,000 to $119,000,000,000. This is approximately double the income of fifteen years ago and more than treble the income of a decade ago. All of which means that, in a decade and a half, gifts to churches and related charities have decreased 30 per cent! The decrease in the year 1940 was nearly 40 per cent, but the average has picked up some 10 per cent in the last three years. In seeking for explanations, we think at once, of course, of the greatly increased burden of taxation. Especially are those in the upper brackets unable any longer to give the large gifts which were once their custom, and this makes a great difference in the totals. In recent years, the thirty millions in the lower income brackets are beginning to feel the pinch of taxes. In addition in these days are the demands for the purchase of war bonds, for contributions to the Red Cross, etc. Never were there so many and so insistent demands. But still there remains the vast discrepancy between an enormously increased income and an alarmingly decreased offering for churches. And how can this ultimately be explained if not on the basis of a changed public attitude toward churches? Organized religion simply does not hold the respect and the allegiance which it once did. Society is becoming more and more secularized, and thus divorced from the influences and obligations of religion. Especially must this be true in the world of Protestantism. The figures are not at hand, but I have not a doubt that Judaism, especially in these later years, is holding its own, and that Roman Catholicism is showing little if any decline. It is the Protestant churches which are losing members, contributions, Sunday school children, and young people. And no man yet has pointed the way toward the recovery of the losses increasingly sustained. The latest hope is that this war is going to lead to a great spiritual revival. Nothing could be farther from the truth. The war is visiting irreparable damage upon the churches and all that they are supposed to represent in the hearts of men. To get rid of war is the first condition of reviving religion. Not otherwise can religion, or any other good thing, survive at all.

VI

Here is a problem for the psychologist! Why are women so eager to imitate men? Why is there always some fad for making women look as nearly as possible like men? Way back, when I was a boy or young man, the women suddenly began blossoming out in tailor-made suits. The coats were cut after the style of men's coats, and the wearers put on men's collars and neckties. Not so long ago came the period when the women all cut off their hair, and many of them had their pates as closely cropped as men. It was ridiculous and ugly, but seemed to give the women in question great satisfaction. Now we have women wearing slacks —not only in their kitchens and boudoirs but also in the city streets. Anything, apparently, to get on men's clothes and swagger abroad like males! But we never see men doing this sort of thing. What would we think if men all of a sudden began wearing fluffy blouses, or letting their hair grow long in permanent waves, or putting on dresses and long silk stockings? We would think that the men had gone crazy, or else were flaunting some strange and loathsome kind of vice in the public eye. Yet logically the one thing is quite as reasonable as the other. If women are going to put on men's clothes, why should not men put on women's clothes? The answer is psychological—that what is possible in the one case is simply impossible in the other! Which raises the question—why? An authoritative answer to this question would be wholesome. Meanwhile, I find myself suspecting that what we have here is a strange survival into our times of women's traditional sense of inferiority. These curious creatures who are so eager to abandon their own charming femininity and become as much like men as possible, must regard men as some superior type of being. To look like a man, to act like a man, this is to escape to some higher level of existence and therewith take on an importance otherwise deemed to be impossible. That men's clothes and haircuts are the ugliest things ever conceived by mortal mind, and women in their own native right the incarnation of sheer beauty, only adds to the supreme irony of this situation. The whole thing is a sad commentary on the dignity and self-respect of women. I shall believe that women as a group are really free and equal not when we have passed every last law of emancipation, but when women no longer ape their males, but are content to be themselves.

Call to Arms!

Arouse yourselves, you sons of pioneers,
Forget your selfish aims, reject the small,
Forsake the luxuries that soften you,
Subdue the savage lurking in the flesh,
Search for new continents within the mind,
Risk the untried, explore and test the new,
And thus reveal the riches of the soul,
The unknown glories possible to man.
Arouse yourselves, you sons of pioneers.

LEE SPENCER

Jottings

Vesuvius put on a good show recently. The bombing of Monte Cassino, boasted as the greatest ever, probably persuaded the ancient volcano to exhibit a bit of the real thing. Man is getting on in this business of destruction, but he can still learn a few things of Mother Nature.

Unable any longer to conquer his enemies, Hitler has now turned to conquering his friends. But Hungary is poor compensation for Russia!

Two circuit judges in Alabama recently had a fight in chambers. One judge used an ash-stand as a weapon, and the other a cuspidor. This, I suppose, is the judicial temperament in action!

This war is certainly dreadful. Witness the liquor shortage, the drastic curtailing of cigars for civilian use, and the absence of any supply of Manila hempen rope for hangmen!

This "precision bombing" is getting to be pretty terrible. One day American flyers hit the Swiss city of Shaffhausen, and the next day they dropped bombs smack on Venafro, an Italian town occupied by Allied troops. These unfortunate episodes help to explain what frequently happens when bombs are "aimed" at factories and munition plants.

Quadruplets and even quintuplets seem to be a stable item of news these days. Is this nature's way of replenishing the population?

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The Great Historical Boomerang

STANTON A. COBLENTZ

It has been variously contended that Germany's worst mistake in the present war occurred when she attacked Russia; when she brought the United States into the conflict; when she failed to follow up Dunkirk with an invasion of Great Britain; and when she discontinued the air blitz upon England at the very moment of possible success. Sometimes I wonder, however, whether the future commentator will not reject all their theories; whether he will not say that the supreme, the fatal blunder of the Nazis was to start the air blitz upon England at all. It was by the air arm, the historian may point out, that Hitler hoped to guarantee his triumph; but it was the air arm that guaranteed his defeat. And the reason for his failure is to be found less in the nature of air power itself than in a fact intimately connected with the character of all warfare: that weapons employed by one side may sooner or later be utilized by the enemy.

In the spring of 1940, the coming critic may assert, Hitler was so strong that he could have established conditions of air warfare with every expectation of having them respected. He might have proclaimed:

> My air fleet today is the strongest on earth. At a word from me, vast sections of Rotterdam, Belgrade, London, Liverpool, Coventry can be laid in ruins. However, so long as the enemy will follow the same rule, I will withhold all attacks on centers of population. So long as the Allied forces accept my lead, this war will not be waged against civilians.

What would have happened had Hitler issued such a proclamation? Does anyone suppose that Cologne, Hamburg, Berlin would lie in ruins today? True, Hitler would have lost his original advantage in damaging British cities and production. But he would have averted far greater damage to German cities and production. It is inconceivable that the Allies, spared the expected terror from above, would have visited a similar terror upon the Axis; inconceivable that they would not have embraced the new rules of warfare gladly, exultantly. The enemy cities, even in the absence of any bilateral agreement, would have been held as inviolable as enemy hospital ships; and warfare, as in the past, would have been mainly the concern of land armies.

It is not at all impossible that Hitler would have made such a declaration of policy, except for one deterrent: that he expected his bomber fleets to bring England to her knees, and could not foresee a time when he would be on the receiving end of the air blows. In other words, he had no realization, as applied to his particular case, of the fact mentioned above: that no weapon can permanently remain the exclusive possession of one side in a conflict.

But if he blundered supremely in failing to recognize this truth, has his error not a lesson even for his enemies? Is it not possible that we are being similarly remiss, are similarly failing to acknowledge one of the basic realities of history? Is not the entire story of warfare a tale of aggressive weapons used against the aggressors, of bows and arrows turned to slay the arrow-makers, of cannon shells hurled against the builders of cannon, with the result that a temporary advantage for one side becomes converted into a permanent destroyer for all? It is impossible to ask these questions without thinking of the increased tempo of the modern race for new means of destruction—means which, while largely kept secret today, will be among the commonplaces of tomorrow.

Let us, for the sake of definiteness, consider a single new device recently declared to be under construction: a super-plane capable of flying from New York to Berlin and back with a large bombing load. Naturally, no one not in a confidential position can state whether the accounts are accurate; but it is certain that the possibility, and even the practicability, of such giant bombers has been insisted upon by de Seversky and other authorities. We are safe, therefore, in assuming that such bombers, if not being built today, are likely soon to be built. And if they are to be built, certain facts become disquietingly evident.

At the present moment, despite past black-outs, dim-

outs, and a certain amount of alarm, the entire continental United States is free of the danger of land-based air attack; no existing airplane, to our knowledge, can reach us on a round trip from any possession of Japan or Germany. But suppose that we yield to the temptation—and the necessity of winning the war may seem to demand that we do yield—of constructing bombers with a range of seven or eight thousand miles; bombers which, from our present outposts, may heap destruction upon Tokyo. It is possible that such battleships of the air would attain their immediate objective, and so would appreciably hasten the day of victory in the Pacific—always, of course, leaving out of account the improbability that Japan could build similar bombers in time to retaliate in force. But just what sort of a post-war situation would we then face?

If the world continued in its present state of disorganization—and I shall consider the alternative a little later—we may be certain that the future would witness a race for the construction of super-bombers. Such far-flying instruments of havoc would be deemed as essential to the arsenal of every country as are cruisers and submarines to every navy today. Then what of the isolation, what of the security of American cities? New York and Washington would be as vulnerable from the European continent, or almost as vulnerable, as are London and Plymouth today; Los Angeles, San Francisco and Seattle might crumble beneath bombs from the Japanese islands—and little consolation it would be to the men, women, and children crushed in the rubble that we could inflict similar destruction upon Munich or Yokohama. By the very weapons that had ended the security of our foes, we would have ended our own security. We would have been, as it were, hanged on our own gallows.

This does not necessarily mean that the remedy is for us not to construct long-range bombers. For the race of the modern weapons proceeds at such break-neck speed that if we do not create a long-distance assault fleet our enemies may do so, either in this conflict or in one to follow. Yet if we do create such a fleet, we may but hasten the day when its deadliness is hurled against our own doors; we may be repeating, on an even vaster scale, the ghastly error of Hitler in turning his bombers loose upon London. This does, literally, place us between the twin "horns of a dilemma"; and either horn may impale us like a scimitar. What, therefore, are we to do? Should we refuse the advantages of present superiority?—something no nation has been known to do since the king-warrior Asoka, in ancient India, voluntarily renounced the sword! Or should we face the assurance of future retribution? Into such darkness and uncertainty we have been backed by the very facts of modern warfare; and thus far, even like that renowned failure Hitler, we have refused to recognize reality. Yet reality is there; and from its strangling clutch there is only one visible path of escape.

This path of escape is not in a unilateral declaration, such as might have been possible for Hitler in 1940; events have moved so rapidly that what might have been practicable then is hardly conceivable today. But before we consider the potential way out, let us ask ourselves this question: at what point will nations, amid the passion and desperation of modern warfare, stop short of employing any available weapon? And the answer is that, in view of commonplaces such as the bombing of civilian centers by both sides and of attacks without warning upon merchant ships, there are few limits at which warring nations can be expected to halt unless restrained by an overweening power or by fear. Fear—though a very uncertain deterrent—probably accounts for the fact that the Germans, in the face of the warnings of Prime Minister Churchill, have not during the first years of the war engaged in any general poison gas attacks, thereby exactly reversing the attitude they manifested in the air raids upon England. But one may be sure that fear would give way to "military necessity" if the Germans were confident of gaining any advantage through the use of gas; hence the restraints imposed by fear only emphasize the fact that the rules of the game are those of relentless might.

This means that—since fear will cease to restrain as soon as it is replaced by the assurance of superior power—there is neither a guaranty nor a likelihood that any nation in future will withhold the use of any weapon however diabolical, provided that it has a head-start in its utilization. The mistake made by Hitler in attacking England by air, instead of outlawing air attacks upon civilians, is certain to be repeated if warfare continues on its present course; and the results, as already indicated, may be even grimmer and costlier than those of the German blunder of 1940. This, furthermore, is certain: that no nation of itself will be strong enough to resist the tendency to employ all possible implements of aggression; and no alliance of nations, unless of such universal scope and clearly preponderant power as to stamp out all warfare, will do more than to accelerate the potential pace of warfare.

What is needed, obviously, is not merely another League of Nations; not merely a world government, though such a consummation may be deemed indispensable. What is needed is world-wide control of the manufacture of arms and munitions; what is needed is some supreme body capable of curtailing the noxious products of modern inventiveness, and of suppressing entirely any device whose chief fruit seems likely to be havoc. Considering the world's present chaos and the ingrained hatreds and animosities between race and race and between country and country, it is hard to conceive that any World State will be able to impose peace and order for generations to come so long as possibilities of national aggression remain. And possibilities of aggression will, obviously, remain just so long as the idea of sovereignty is preserved; just so long as each nation supervises its arms industry and the inventors of each nation may steal a march on their neighbors. The often mooted establishment of an international police force, to compel order by the application of power no single nation could match, might prove unavailing if the individual nations remained capable of developing new weapons, some of which might conceivably embolden them to resist the entire family of nations. And the situation might be particularly acute if a powerful organism, such as pre-war Germany or Japan, should succeed in drawing to itself one or two strong allies.

Admittedly, it will be very far from easy, by means of any international association, to clamp down control upon the production of arms and the flow of inventions. But nothing appears more certain than that no international association, in the long run, will succeed unless it does obtain such control. Whatever its merits in other directions, whatever harmony of action and feeling it may instill, a world in which individual nations can plot and build with the deadly offerings of modern science will be like a city in which any man may establish a private arsenal by means of which to blow up

his neighbors. Reliance on superior numbers alone will prove misleading, as was demonstrated when the first wielder of a bow and arrow put to rout a host armed with clubs—or when the first user of a machine gun kept at bay a corps of rifle wielders. By means of some devastating new weapons, tomorrow's Hitler—if we permit it—will commit the same error as did the Hitler of 1940; will attempt, by new tools and techniques, to enthrone his ruthless minority in supremacy over the world majority. And though he will doubtless fall amid the ensuing shambles, the earth will be shaken by spasms from which it may not recover for centuries, if indeed it ever recovers at all.

The conclusion is obvious. We must not only establish a world organization; we must take steps to see that eventually it becomes the sole arms manufacturing medium, granting to each nation only so much as is indispensable for local police protection. We must place agents of the world organization in every country, to make sure that this provision is carried out; and we must create an international patent bureau, through which all inventions of all nations must pass, and by which those of possible military utility will be sifted, to be confiscated if too menacing, and otherwise to be regulated and controlled by the world power. The difficulties and dangers involved in these proposals are evident; moreover, the problem of obtaining the necessary relinquishment of national sovereignty will prove knotty in the extreme. Yet there is, unfortunately, no sure and easy road to peace; and no matter what path we follow, we will end in the quicksands of disillusion if any nation or group of nations retains the power to follow the mirage of quick and easy victory through some untried miraculous new invention.

What the Church Can Do

EDMUND A. OPITZ

The church must have certain affirmations for our day framed in terms of its tradition. The ramparts it watches are selected emphases from its history; emphases which the church perceives are needed now if we would recover a sane and balanced society. The question for churchmen is: What pressing needs of society is the church peculiarly fitted to supply? An answer might be framed in some such terms as the following.

The church should strive for situations in which reasonable solutions have a chance of application. Force can settle problems, but such settlements have a way of spawning ghosts that are not so easily laid. Permanent settlement can occur only when there is a reasonable opportunity for the various elements of a situation to come to rest where their specific gravity assigns them. The Copernican revolution is a case in point. It is conceivable that hostile forces in church and state could have suppressed the theory and killed off its proponents had they been so minded. It is a matter of record that a few of them were so minded. The problems roused by Copernicus would thus have been solved—only to bob up again at a later period to bedevil the authorities. Relatively free inquiry, on the other hand, allowed the implications of Copernican astronomy to assume their place in the hierarchy of values.

The emphasis on reasonableness in religion has not been a persistent one, it is true, but America's greatest religious leader, William Ellery Channing, asserted time and again that man's reason and conscience took priority over any book or creed, because they were closer to God. In his famous sermon, "Unitarian Religion," delivered in Baltimore in 1819, he declared:

> We indeed grant, that the use of reason in religion is accompanied with danger. But we ask any honest man to look on the history of the church, and say, whether the renunciation of it be not still more dangerous.

The first emphasis of the church as a specific for these times is the emphasis on reasonableness in men's dealings with one another and in their attack upon current problems.

The church is peculiarly fitted to keep alive a high opinion of man at a time when many a candid observer finds it hard to suppress the thought that man is one of nature's major mistakes. The church functions here because it takes the long view and suggests that man is a creature of more promise than his actions at any given time seem to warrant. This emphasis has been weak at times in the history of the church, but not in the distinctly American religion of Doctor Channing. The church, he says, should penetrate "the present disguises and humbling circumstances of human nature, and speak with earnestness of what it was made for and what it may become." Fantastic hopes of human progress are bound to end in despair. The religious view of man sees him as a creature of error, often turning away from the good and seeking the bad, often losing hard-won gains, but still as a creature of more promise than is apparent on the surface. History is bound to have some black periods, man being what he is. There is a jagged streak of violence running through him, but there is more to him than that. Pascal suggests that we never remind man of his kinship with the brute without at the same time hinting at his kinship with the angels. Secular views of man are apt to be partial, limited to one or the other of these, but we cannot be fair to man without acknowledging both sides. This is but to urge translation into modern terms of the age-old religious concept of man as a child of God tainted with original sin. We can hold a high opinion of man only if we recognize how tenacious is the grip of the primeval slime out of which he is emerging, how tortuous his ascent. While his fists assault heaven's gate, his feet are mired in the earth. But such a creature! Able to span the universe with thought, and prone to believe in the total depravity of his neighbor. The church maintains a high opinion of man because it sees his destiny in terms of his origin, and his origin in terms of his destiny.

Because we are the kind of creatures that leave undone the things we ought to do, and do the things we ought not to do, and because we attempt to remove the mote that is in our brother's eye without first removing the beam that is in our own, we need some institution that preaches penitence. It is the only insurance against those two most horrible afflictions, self-righteousness and smugness. Calvin Coolidge's preacher was reputedly against sin, but, really, a balanced citizen needs a little quantum of it. We despair of a man when he parades his seven deadly virtues, but there is nothing

wrong with him that a few vices would not cure.

There are certain conditions in which man can act as a free agent. But again, his ignorance, folly, greed, and short-sightedness involve him in situations where he is not free. In such situations, he is forced to reflect, and finds reflection fails him. He is forced to act, but rational and conscientious action is denied him. This constitutes for man a tragic predicament, similar to that of the hero of the Greek tragedies. In these tragedies, the hero has been caught by inexorable forces that he has not correctly appraised until they capture and crush him. There is no escape save by committing monstrous evil. Similar situations face modern man, notably in war. Once in a war, we are condemned to fight as the penalty for the sins of omission and commission which led to the war. We are condemned either to commit or condone offenses which under other circumstances we would deplore. For instance, we prefer to let children on the Continent starve rather than run the risk of having food get into Hitler's hands. It is this kind of thing that constitutes the real horror of war, not a battle in the clouds between two evenly matched fighter pilots, even though one dies.

The church's emphasis on penitence assumes importance at this point. Some things become necessary when man is involved in a tragic predicament, but they do not become right thereby. Force may destroy evil, but it can only clear the ground for good; it cannot enthrone it. In times of war, certain acts become necessary, which by no stretching of ethical theory can be termed right, but the right gets a toe in the door if the necessary acts are done penitently.

It is no part of the church's business to urge men to kill other men; the business of the church is to strive with all its might to prevent situations where it becomes necessary for men to kill other men. But when there is no other alternative but to do the necessary, the church should urge penitence.

Machiavelli said that the French did not understand politics, "for if they did they would never allow the Church to become so great." There is a tendency on the part of the state to try to assimilate the church. This the church should never allow, for its interests and aims can never coincide exactly with the interests and aims of the society in which it finds itself. The ends for which the church urges loyalty extend across national borders to encompass humanity. Some institution should represent the claims of man as man, as opposed to man, the prisoner of geography. This the church has aimed at in the times of its strength, deriving its practice from its principle of the fatherhood of God. But this principle need not be held as a theological belief in order for us to acknowledge the value of periodically listening to the claims of the whole as opposed to the clamor of the parts. The church is a free institution within the state; it is not supported by the state nor should it support the state. That is to say, it should not busy itself in finding religious excuses for the state's policy. The church should not lend-lease its halos to the state in which it happens to be, thus canonizing an accident of geography.

It is not argued that the church has always done all these things: emphasized reasonableness in men's dealings with each other, cherished a high opinion of man, distinguished between the necessary and the good, and acted as a critic of the society in which it happens to find itself. But it is urged that all these things can be found in the traditions of the church, sometimes well concealed, it is true, but nonetheless there. They should be dug out, dusted off, and used for the benefit of man. If they are not, society will abandon the church which has forsaken it.

Life Under the Reich

O. A. HAMMAND

The Fatherland is in despair; on the Russian front the pressure is terrific; every day and every night bombers and fighters stream out across the channel and punish the Reich; in Italy the Allied armies crowd in closer and closer and a ring of steel is rapidly choking the continent. The Germans are tired, sick, hungry, and scared. It is their reward for loyalty to the Nazi regime, and before them remains only the choice between desperate alternatives.

Germany has made many attempts at imperialism. She went through the Thirty Years' War and the Franco-Prussian War, and still came out without much to show in the way of colonies, but she had become a war power and a thoroughly militarized country—the teaching of Karl von Clausewitz, 1780 to 1831, had taken root. He was supported by Otto von Bismarck, 1815 to 1898, a true imperialist, one who did not want colonies but believed in a strong and aggressive state. His union included twenty-two German Principalities and three republics, and went along together for forty-five years. There followed also the code of Friedrich Nietzsche, 1844 to 1900, which emphasized that imperialism is founded on the inequality of man. It is the code of superiority. One race is superior to another; one nation is superior to another; one language, one class, one man is superior to another.

At the close of the first World War, Germany was trimmed on all sides. Alsace-Lorraine was given back to France, not under a mandate but ceded in fee. Czechoslovakia and Poland were made free and independent and the Danzig corridor established. It may have been the right thing to do but it created several new small states, increased the number of boundary lines, with communication, transportation, and travel problems, and threw another group of people under new bosses. Small states are fine in a well-ordered and peaceful world because they provide a conscience with a strong influence for democracy, liberty, and justice, but they are a problem and a temptation to a strong aggressor.

And now another war had come. Hitler through years of marching, talking, blatant barnstorming nationalism and patriotism had become master of Germany. His storm troopers rode down and crushed all opposition, and a paperhanger was the new boss of The Fatherland. Next he went to work on Austria. If there was any business man who wanted to make money he could do business with Hitler; if there was any politician or preacher who wanted to sell his soul he could find a market; if there was any writer or professor who wanted a high-priced job in a German

University he could have it. Money meant nothing to Adolf Hitler, for he was dealing in power and he bought and sold the lives and souls of men, and when any man or woman stood in the way, that man or woman was run out of the country, put in a concentration camp, or assassinated.

Hitler as master of the new Germany assassinated Dolfuss and grabbed up Austria. He applied pressure on Czechoslovakia, and in the face of a disunited world forced Chamberlain into the Munich peace. America grumbled and scolded and cried appeasement, but did nothing more. But later it was all wrong—"England had sold Czechoslovakia down the river." Hitler went on through Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France, taking them over one by one with no League of Nations or other machinery of law and order strong enough to resist. Of course all he wanted was "to prevent encirclement and bring a new order and permanent peace to Europe."

In June, 1940, the Germans pushed deep into France and France collapsed. Americans in astonishment asked the question: "Why was it that France did not prepare?" The answer is that France did prepare. She did everything humanly possible in a military way but military methods would not suffice. She built her armies bigger and bigger, putting a terrible strain on her economic resources so that business was upset and labor unemployed. When the idle men accumulated they were put into the army which gradually ate its own head off and increased and aggravated the problem. As the people got hungry they also got radical, so many of the liberals became radicals and many of the conservatives became reactionaries; and wealth and power and religion cried "Communist" and made friends with Hitler, Mussolini, and the Tories in England, and the "safe and sane" wherever they could find them. The French military machine had blown up. They had discovered that 40,000,000 Frenchmen could not compete in a military way with 80,000,000 Germans.

Just across the channel stood the white cliffs of Dover. "They are mine," shouted Hitler. Then Hitler turned his hordes toward the channel and demanded that England surrender. Hitler assembled his mighty air force and dropped bombs and sent his fiery, smoking, shrieking engines of death down on the great metropolis, and John Bull threw back his head and took it. And Hitler assembled bigger and mightier airplanes and battleships and made assaults against the shores of Britain; and ships burned and men died and airplanes were blasted out of the sky, and still old England stood firm under the morning mist. A frown of amazement and bewilderment gathered on the face of the mighty Hitler. He could not understand why England would not give up when she was licked.

It has been and still is the object and purpose of Adolf Hitler to consolidate Europe, the only difference being that he is trying to do it in another way. We want to do it and maintain liberty and he wants to do it and take away our liberty, and that one thing makes all the difference in the world. If the Allied powers succeed in winning the war, they must also succeed in maintaining a system which will provide life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, or else they have failed. It is useless to fight a war and waste our blood and treasure and in the end have the same thing that Hitler is attemping to force upon us.

To start with, how did Hitler approach the subject of a new Europe? Did he request any orderly and peaceable meeting with any single nation or the League? Did he ask for any economic conference or disarmament conference? Did he ask for any consideration of tariffs or immigration quotas? Did he seek any investigation of the status of minorities in race or nationality or religion? Did he send representatives to the International Labor Organization or request that a German jurist be considered for appointment to the World Court? Was there ever one of his speeches that expressed a friendly attitude toward the outside world or indicated any desire to approach his problems as common problems with the rest of the world? I think not!

He did it in another way. He hatched up plots and conspiracies in beer halls; he organized the youth and taught them the poison of supernationalism and goosestepism. He made barnstorming orations from balconies and told the people how badly off they were; how they were cheated, abused, betrayed, humiliated, and disgraced. He did anything and everything to create unrest and friction and to cause trouble and start war. That is not a peaceable or legal method; that is the violent and illegal method. The two ways are in direct conflict; one is the peaceful method and the other the war method. Hitler chose the latter and he got what he wanted. He could get nothing else. That kind of thinking and working brings only one result: no matter whether it is a German aspirant for power or any other person, that kind of seed brings that kind of harvest. The Nazi soldiers whom we dislike so much are just nice young German boys indoctrinated by a long period of militarism, nationalism, and patriotism.

Many men and women throughout the world believe that some adequate punishment should be administered to Germany at the close of the war; that her offense is too great to be disregarded and that it would be politically a mistake to excuse her and ignore her crime. It is also generally agreed that punishment by a money indemnity is inadequate and impracticable, for in that way we just punish ourselves; and that payment in goods will not be accepted. There remains only one way that is humane and effectual. It is to take away a small part of her land. First, give East Prussia, that center of absolutism and militarism, to Poland as a judgment for damages. This is only token punishment, yet it is suitable to the crime and will have the proper effect. And there is the Saarland, that choice industrial district of 1,200 square miles lying on the western border, which should be given back to France. That territory was taken over temporarily as punishment for Germany after the first World War, was governed by a commission of the League of Nations, and was returned to Germany by a plebiscite. But Germany has again forfeited her right, and this time for good. Let this be given to France as a judgment for her damages in World War II.

But there is something more important than damages. It is to transform Germany into a peaceable nation, and this must be done by getting rid of its military system. First Germany must be disarmed; which includes land, sea, and air disarmament, with provision that there is to be no rearmament; and mechanism must be provided to see that this rule is not violated. More important, however, is psychological disarmament which includes the abolition of military training in all forms for young and old alike. This is the only way that the military spirit can be eliminated and the desire to fight can be changed to the necessary and useful activities of peace.

Post-War World: Public Enemy No. 1

ROBERT S. HOAGLAND

At least two eminent historians are collecting and organizing materials for their books on the origins of World War II. The general nature of the material available to them will strengthen the position of those who, Oscar Wilde said, "see the price of everything and the value of nothing"—the cynics. The historians will be able to look truth in the face and tolerate it; but many of those persons too small to digest the truth will resent it. To tell the truth is not hard; to be reconciled to it, is.

Others than eminent historians are able to assemble materials on World War II which are disillusioning to those of insufficient moral stability. An amateur can do it.

I have more than a thousand eight-by-eleven, single-spaced, typewritten pages of notes in this field, plus three-to-five thousand unorganized clippings. Even a superficial examination of this material reveals enough political dynamite to blast the weak out of their poorly-grounded faith in the institutions of the Republic and in the integrity of some leaders. As I leaf through my clippings and move through my notes, I often feel that I ought to destroy the whole mess. There is unlimited bitterness there, black disillusionment. How many, as a Swiss proverb queries, can endure the truth to win wisdom? *There* will be a rub in the post-war world.

A foresighted American liberal gloomily surveys, in a recent literary periodical, "the cynical reaction which will set in after this war and how it will feed upon anything it can grab to prove that there were no rights and wrongs in this war. . . ."

Yes, there will be many cynicisms. Documentation to establish such as the following can easily be secured.

Cynicism concerning the value of liberalism. One still robustly optimistic liberal says, "The late liberals were taxidermists to a dead principle." There will be cynicism from many angles against Labor; and cynicism within Labor because it "put all its eggs in one basket," because it dallied with a "the ends justifies the means" policy. There will be cynicism about the unity of the United Nations. There will be cynicism over secret diplomatic agreements. And over arrogant contempt in some leaders for the popular will. There will be hindsighted cynicism about the ideology declaring World War II to be a People's War. There will be cynicism about British Imperialism. And American. There will be cynicism about oil diplomacy and about our puzzling commercial activities in Iran. And cynicism as to whether the American people had a democratic voice in foreign policy. Professor Peffer has unwittingly added high octane fuel to this cynicism. Cynicism will be heaped on cynicism, with pygmies replacing the giants in the Ossa on Pelion phrase. Moreover, a good case *can* be made out for any of these cynicisms. I can do so.

The point I want to make, however, is that on whatever side of whatever argument any responsible person may have stood in the immediate past, that person has one job now and in the post-war world—to contest every inch of the possible advance of cynicism.

The time to begin is now.

The same line-up that caused disaster after World War I is already clear. It is the *I-Told-You-Sos* versus the *You-Stand-Patters-Did-Its*. The material for this controversy is already piling up; it is found to its clearest degree in such books as John Flynn's *As We Go Marching*, P. A. Sorokin's *The Crisis of Our Age*, William Henry Chamberlin's *The World's Iron Age*, James Burnham's *The Managerial Revolution*, and *The Machiavellians*, and a good score of others.

Just after World War I the *I-Told-You-Sos* had their day in their attacks on possible plans of unity for a punch-drunk world. And those who have insisted that a little band of bigoted men prevented "world co-operation" have always maintained their audiences. These two phases of a mutually unpleasant criticism are of the value of the criticism in the ancient German story of a man traveling with his little boy and a donkey. As they passed through the first town on their trip, the man was riding and the boy walking. People gibed: "Look at that heartless man making the boy walk." Through the second town the man walked and the boy rode. Then the people indicted the boy: "It is terrible that that healthy boy should ride and his old father walk." At the third town, they both walked. The criticism was: "Aren't they fools, to have a donkey and not use him?" Coming to the fourth town, both rode. The good citizens there said, "The cruel monsters, making that poor donkey work so hard!" Through the fifth town they carried the donkey. "Idiots!"

Even a cursory examination of such a book as Stephen Bonsal's *Unfinished Business* or a dip into Colonel House's *Memoirs* reveals the glaring inadequacy of both views concerning the wrecking of the peace after War I. It does not take a Sidney B. Fay or a Harry Elmer Barnes to show up prejudices here. A number of complicated factors sabotaged the last peace. Increasingly, today, liberals see that the same factors will upset this peace. On the one hand, yes, the unregenerate stubbornness of bitter-enders will be disastrous; but equally disastrous will have been the wartime failure of many genuine idealists to realize that (in the nature of morality as a process) the means used to secure an end define and form that end. It will be impossible unilaterally to assess the blame for the potential failure of the peace to come.

But the cynicisms will be leafing out luxuriantly, and malodorously. We ought to be uniting now, we "progressives," against cynicism with its dissension and division. It will destroy faith in our institutions, in our traditions. We can lose faith in certain men without fatal loss to our stamina as democrats, but we dare not lose faith in the institutions and traditions of democracy. More critical than unemployment in this country, or political anarchy in Central Europe or in the Far East, would be the destruction of our moral and spiritual vigor. If the stamina remains, we can struggle on.

Recriminations between the *I-Told-You-Sos* and others are and will be idiotic, worse than futile. We ought to organize now against them and against the cynicism from which they will grow. Public Enemy Number One now and in post-war United States of America is cynicism. It is cynicism that hurls peoples into the despairing paralysis of inaction, which breeds totalitarianism.

All liberals ought to forget their divisions and keep in mind only positive aims, which can be ground among men of good will for common cause. It is perchance enough to stress the maximum fulfillment of worthy human needs.

The Study Table

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY

STRANGE FRUIT. *By Lillian Smith. New York: Reynal & Hitchcock. 371 pp. $2.75.*

Boston is without doubt a very distinguished city. Her history is distinguished, so are her beans and her cod, her Cabots and her Lodges. When Boston does anything, she does it in a grand style. A recent *faux pas* was committed by her Commissioner of Police who was instrumental in having the sale of Lillian Smith's novel, *Strange Fruit,* banned on the grounds of "obscenity." One bookseller was fined, and a buyer was arrested.

Is Lillian Smith's novel about white and black people in a little Georgia town really obscene? *Strange Fruit* is not an objectionable novel, and it is not an obscene book. If ever the spirit of cheap prudery and vulgar Mrs. Grundyism has overreached itself, it did so in this instance. There seems to be little evidence to the effect that any known organization of Boston's esthetes was behind the movement to keep *Strange Fruit* out of the Athens of New England, but already more than faint mutterings are being heard that this or that group of zealots, related to some self-appointed guardian of public morality like the League of Decency, was responsible for this outrage against a fine book whose sale is, of course, being tremendously increased by precisely this sort of attack.

The indignant outcry against this book is directed against the use, twice or three times, of a six-letter word. This word is a nasty word, to be sure, but one that exactly and literally expresses a given situation, in this instance the objectionable advances being made by a teen-age Negro boy to a Negro girl. This use occurs, as the heroine of the story, Nonnie Anderson, at a tragic climax in her experience, recalls the incident and the terrible impression it had left on her sensitive mind. I have it from a distinguished—and hardly "prudish"—colleague of mine that Miss Smith might have used another word here. But why? Under the circumstances, and in the interest of literary veracity, this was precisely the word that would come to mind as the term commonly used by teen-age children who can hardly be expected to use other than "nasty" words for biological phenomena that their elders tell them *are* "nasty." Why should the author have spoiled the honesty and realism of her narrative with consideration for some crinolined and wasp-bodiced advocate of a pre-Victorian respectability? I doubt whether there is one important literary critic in America who will consider Miss Smith's use of this particular word either in bad taste or in exaggerated style. As a matter of fact, several readers of *Strange Fruit* I have met had forgotten all about the book's alleged "obscenity"; but they had remembered its many fine qualities and memorable features. I am sure that our high school students and college undergraduates who read this book, and they will read it on the authority of Boston's disapproval, will feel little shock at the "naughty word," forget it at once, and emerge from this literary experience as pure in morals and as innocent spiritually as they would have been had they never read the book.

Strange Fruit is a very well-written story about the love of a white man, Tracy Deen, for a Negro girl, Nonnie Anderson. The locale is Maxwell, a sleepy town in Georgia, where the typical southern attitude still prevails, viz., that a "Nigger," no matter what his education or standing in a profession, must "keep his place." The "superior" whites of Georgia will stand for no uppishness in the black man; they will not "Mister" him or "Miss" or "Missus" her. First names are good enough for the "inferior race," and that's that.

Nonnie, her older sister and brother, children of parents only a generation removed from slavery, have gone to college and received every educational advantage a mother's sacrifices could afford. Only the brother makes use of his education by going to Washington and working there; the sisters are condemned to remain in Maxwell and there to serve in the humble capacities of domestics and nursemaids. Tracy Deen, son of one of Maxwell's "better families," has known Nonnie since her childhood. Returning as veteran from the first World War, he makes love to her and when she reveals to him that she is with child he advises her to marry his servant Henry, who as a boy had made those improper advances to her, the memory of which stirred her so terrifyingly and the report of which induces the author to use the offending word.

Nonnie's brother, overhearing Tracy's last words with Nonnie and realizing his sister's plight, shoots Tracy and escapes. The aroused community, however, finds its desire for revenge satisfied by pinning the guilt of the murder on Henry, who is lynched and burned at the stake. It is in her quiet and restrained description of these scenes, particularly of the lynching which we see through the reports of eyewitnesses, that Miss Smith shows her skill as craftswoman and her profound ability at characterization, interpretation, and psychological motivation. As a prominent reviewer has said: "The tragedy of the South is explicit in every line. . . . *Strange Fruit* is an important book, by any standard. It should be required reading in every deanery, every parsonage—and every legislature, on both sides of the Mason-Dixon Line."

◇ ◇ ◇ ◇

BLESSED ARE THE MEEK. *By Zofia Kossak. Translated by Rulka Langer. New York: Roy Publishers. 373 pp. $3.00.*

Is it entirely fortuitous that since the outbreak of World War II we should have had three important novels whose chief characters so beautifully incarnate the virtures of meekness and humility? There are *Keys of the Kingdom* with the appealing figure of Fr. Chisholm; *The Song of Bernadette* with its heroine so completely devoted to self-effacement and humility; and now this recent novel by a Polish writer in exile with the central figure that of the great mystic and saint of the Middle Ages, St. Francis of Assisi. It may be that in times when nothing counts so much as power and the consciousness of power, when nothing seems more out of place than self-effacement and humility, and when both the aggressor and those who oppose the aggressor vaunt their pride of arms and their superiority of purpose and power—it may well be that precisely at such

times men's souls experience a nostalgia for the more delicate and humane virtues and emotions and therefore readily take refuge in a book which like this one portrays a character utterly devoted to the ideals of poverty and obedience. True, it is not easy to arrive at a final judgment of a personality like that of St. Francis. What has been written about him still appears so extraordinary, so strange, so fascinating, and so contradictory that men still wonder what he really was—whether saint, seer, and prophet, or heretic, charlatan, and rogue. Madame Kossak would seem to make it easier for us to see St. Francis as history and legend would have us see him, as a "fool in Christ" indeed, but for all that "a fool" as judged by common human standards of reasonability and prudence, and probably just for that reason the sort of "blessed fool" regarding which we can only pray, "God, send us more of them!"

That days of great upheaval and disturbance frequently produce characters that are completely out of tune with their times, is a not infrequent testimony of history. We recall that such saints as the great Augustine and that illustrious monastic, St. Benedict, lived and worked in the days of the decline of the Roman Empire, and we can the better appreciate the comfort in their writings and the inspiration of their personal example when we see their fortitude and humility of spirit against the lurid background of war and invasion, of terror and destruction. Similarly, our own none too quiet days have produced their Gandhi and their Kagawa, to mention only two exemplars of humility and saintliness.

The opening pages of Madame Kossak's powerful historical novel project us at once into the turbulent thirteenth century whose first two decades saw the Fourth and Fifth Crusades, the pathetic Children's Crusade, and the beginnings of that new order which, as "The Rule of the Brethren Minor," and later as the Order of St. Francis, was to play so important a role in the life of the church. These were the days when that great churchman and statesman, Pope Innocent III, ruled over Holy Church. He was as eager as his predecessors had been to win back the Holy Land, to settle those internal conflicts in Western Europe that were threatening to tear Christendom asunder, and to bring back into the fold of the "Una Sancta" the erring children of the East. He had seen the hopeful Fourth Crusade fail (1202-1204) because of the greed and selfishness of the Christian princes and leaders; he had witnessed the supreme tragedy of the Children's Crusade in 1212, and he had just rallied the Christian forces for another mighty effort to reconquer the Holy Land, when in 1216 he died. The Fifth Crusade, however, was organized by him, authorized by his successor, Pope Honorius, and conducted by that brilliant soldier and warrior, John, called in these pages, Jean de Brienne, King of Jerusalem. This martial venture, always threatened by the conflicting authority of John and Cardinal Pelagius, came to an inglorious end, despite initial victories, in 1217.

Against the backdrop of these dramatic events, we have St. Francis appearing upon the scene. The son of an Assisi merchant, followed by a few bedraggled mendicants, who as the Brethren Minor have dedicated themselves to the obligations of poverty and obedience, St. Francis has set out to obtain the Pope's recognition for his new order. He and his followers are a motley crowd indeed. They carry nothing with them, depending for food and shelter upon the good nature and charity of their fellow men and relying utterly upon their faith that "God will provide." That the earnestness and zeal of St. Francis and his followers should deeply disturb the clergy and particularly the high church dignitaries of his day, goes without saying, and we have an interesting scene in which Bishop Guido and St. Francis argue the principle of absolute poverty, the churchman finally agreeing that such a revolutionary principle would never be sanctioned by the Holy Father. However, fate enters the picture in the form of a dream that so impresses Pope Innocent that in the presence of a distinguished company of Cardinals and other prelates he not only listens attentively to the plea of the mendicant zealot, but actually grants him license to organize his order.

Rich and poor, noble and commoner, quickly fall under the spell of the simple faith and moving eloquence of St. Francis. Among these is the famous troubadour, William Divini, who hears St. Francis preach in Rome and promptly surrenders his station and property, and follows his new leader as Brother Pacific.

Madame Kossak not only has the faculty of making her characters live, she can also paint mighty canvasses of mass movements and military action with bold and epic strokes. Her description of how a certain Nicholas fascinates the children of Italy and other lands, and gathers them like the Piper of Hamlin into a blindly obedient mob of fanatical teen-age crusaders is most convincing, and her story of this crusade is a masterpiece of historical fiction.

It is in connection with the tragic Fifth Crusade that we read of St. Francis' most amazing exploits. It is his ability to impress the Sultan Al-Kamil that finally saves the Christian armies in Egypt from complete destruction. The impression the Sultan gained from his interview with St. Francis is well reflected in these words spoken by the Sultan to John of Jerusalem who is asking the Moslem ruler for humane terms of surrender for the Christian forces. Says the Sultan: "Remember, King, that only for his sake, for the sake of the one and only Christian whose deeds do not belie his faith, I am ready to spare your lives. Only because of him! I want him to remember me well."

St. Francis has been granted by the Sultan free passage through enemy lands to Jerusalem. He reaches the place where so often his soul had dwelt in vision and dream, and together with a few followers and local Christians sets about rehabilitating such famous shrines as the Basilica of the Holy Sepulchre and the Basilica of the Nativity. While busy with this task, he is called back to Italy and learns that during his absence his order has grown both strong in numbers and rich in property and wealth. He is infinitely distressed; for this is precisely what he wanted to avoid. Absolute poverty and complete obedience to the simple commands of Jesus had been the pillars of his order as he had conceived it. Now everything seems lost, and, weeping bitterly, St. Francis realizes that again power and prestige have undermined and destroyed those spiritual values that in his simple faith could alone save the church and the world. There is, however, a gleam of comfort. Clara Sciffio, the girl friend of his youth, who in the early days of his order had begun to gather women into a religious society based on the principles of St. Francis, is still loyal to him and to his original pur-

pose. "So something of his work had remained in its original form!" He smiles through his tears, and the book closes with St. Francis saying to the messenger, "Then let us go back, brother! God willing, not all of our sowing is lost."

Madame Kossak has given us the story of one of history's strangest and most fascinating personalities, and she has approached her task with not a little of that humility that characterizes the saint she is describing. Her novel is in the grand tradition of the historical novel of Sienkiewicz and of the folk-novel of her great contemporary, Reymont. She discloses a deftness of touch and a sureness of historical perspective that make her pages speak with authority and invest her characters with a reality that throbs with the warm human impulses of a poet and real artist. *Blessed Are the Meek* will take its place among the commanding historical novels of our day.

◇ ◇ ◇ ◇

BREATHE UPON THESE. *By Ludwig Lewisohn. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co. 218 pp. $2.50.*

Have you ever heard of the *Struma*? No? Then you have missed one of the most tragic tales ever told, a tale rivalling the stories of Lidice, of Warsaw, of Rotterdam and of those other places whose names have only recently become immortal symbols of man's inhumanity to man. In this little volume of 218 pages, Ludwig Lewisohn has, as the first among contemporary writers, given literary form to that pathetic incident of two years ago when the Turkish ship, the *Struma,* struck a mine in the Black Sea and went to pieces, only one of her crew and passengers surviving to tell the tale. This story is hardly known in non-Jewish circles, and we must thank Mr. Lewisohn for employing his pen so wisely and artistically to lay upon the conscience of the world the record of an indictment that may well startle and shock the reader.

The facts regarding the *Struma* are briefly these: She was a freighter of fifty feet and 180 tons, with a crew of eight. She had been chartered at an outrageous price to take 769 Jewish refugees, who had been living in a miserable ghetto in Czernowitz, from the Rumanian port Constantsa to Palestine. Men, women, and children were loaded like cattle on this freighter, which lacked even the most primitive human comforts. The passengers, responsible even for their own food, disregarded their discomforts in the hope of an early arrival in the Land of Promise, Palestine. They boarded the ship, singing the ancient hymn, Adon Olam, Lord of the World, and after ten days reached Istanbul. Here the authorities refused them landing privileges until their status had been established, and while they were waiting to hear from the British authorities in Palestine—it was now the middle of January, 1942—the captain of the ship declared that he would not put out with such a cargo again, since the vessel had been found unseaworthy.

Hoping and praying that with the arrival of the immigration certificates, needed for further travel and for entry into Palestine, ways and means for overland transportation might also be found, the passengers heard after several weeks of agonizing uncertainty that no immigration certificates would be issued, and the Turkish authorities informed them that they would have to leave Istanbul. It should not be forgotten that the decision of the British authorities in Palestine not to admit the 769 passengers of the *Struma* was made despite the fact that 1,255 unused immigration certificates were available. Let Mr. Lewisohn tell the rest:

> So that was the end. On February the twenty-fourth, 1942, the *Struma* was towed out of port at the order of the Turkish authorities, despite the renewed insistence of the captain that she was in no condition to put to sea. Thirty miles beyond the straits in the Black Sea she struck a mine and instantly went to pieces. Not one beam stuck to another. Of the seven hundred and sixty-nine souls on board only one was rumored to have survived.

This awful tale climaxes the story of the German-Jewish refugees, Dr. Erich and Mrs. Hannah Dorfsohn, in *Breathe Upon These.* Doctor Dorfsohn has been brought to America by Paul Burnett, president of the Burnett Optical Company in a midwestern industrial city, where wartime industry is on the boom and the particular genius of Doctor Dorfsohn, a distinguished physicist, is being employed to help America in her war against the Fascist aggressors. The Dorfsohns have found their new American environment most congenial and their employer and his family most sympathetic and understanding. It is at their first dinner in the Burnett home that Doctor Dorfsohn is prevailed upon to tell the story of their escape from Hitler's Europe, a story of thrills and adventures in which the American Friends Service Committee and the Unitarian Service Committee ultimately play the roles of advisors and rescuers.

The story is told by Doctor Dorfsohn without bitterness, without any feeling of hatred for their enemies, and without any trace of vindictiveness. On the contrary, he speaks of the guilt involved in the horrible tragedy of these days as one which "all men who were alive in the world and let God's world come to this pass —all had, by that naked fact, incurred in some measure"; and of Germany, the world-famous refugee says, her "poetry and philosophy and music are still like a poison in our blood."

Despite the jacket announcement that the Burnetts, who listen with such fascination to this story and appear so deeply stirred by the *Struma* tragedy and the awful experiences of their friends, are a "typical American family," I have it on Mr. Lewisohn's own authority that we are not to think of them in these terms. On the contrary, Mr. Lewisohn has pictured in the Burnetts the type of an American minority for the existence and slow growth of which he and every other friend of liberty and humanitarian impulse are grateful. If the Burnetts ever become a majority in America we may have reason to expect that the problem of the refugee and the persecuted minorities is well on the way towards solution, for the solution of this problem demands first of all the rise of pity and compassion in our hearts; given these, sympathetic understanding and helpful action must ultimately emerge to give to the world a program of humane and statesmanlike procedure which will make impossible not only a repetition of the *Struma* tragedy but also any recurrence of experiences such as reported by Doctor Dorfsohn in these pages.

Ludwig Lewisohn has in this book called upon the spirit of compassion to blow from the four winds upon the dry bones of human indifference and callousness that they may take on again the semblance of life and warm humanity, and express themselves in terms of humility, mercy, and justice.

Correspondence

Too Much Militarism

To the Managing Editor,
UNITY:

May I ask why it is that, in your conduct of the editorial policy of UNITY—so long and so honorably devoted to the interpretation of religious pacifism—you now publish (with the exception of the sprightly Jeremiads of John Haynes Holmes) no criticisms or clarifications concerning the obscure subject of American war aims and peace polity in Europe or the Pacific, and no words of protest against the epic blunders and crimes that are being committed in the name of decency, freedom, and democracy? Do you think that a new Heaven and a new Earth will emerge from single-minded devotion to the operations of Hell? There must be a psycho-economic reason for your unnatural silence. What is it? Who controls you?

With the condemnation of the numerous Nazi barbarities we are sufficiently familiar by this time; and, if we were not, the communications of the belligerent Victor Yarros would have made us so. But with the role of spiritual warfare and Christianity in general, in time of confused global conflict and tragic misunderstandings, and of Protestant Unitarianism in particular, in the foundation of a more just and peaceful world, in the pacifying and civilizing of the *Furor teutonicus,* in the moral regeneration and political reorganization of Europe, and in the healing of the fatal schism in the Occident, which is bleeding Europe white and debilitating America, exhausting our natural resources and prostrating both our religion and our education—of all this one reads hardly a line in UNITY. What is the matter? What keeps you silent?

Are you afraid? Do you think that religion has nothing more to contribute to political vision and moral therapy, while the execution of a civilization is in progress, save silent assent to the stupid heresy of "unconditional surrender" and a dictated peace pinned together temporarily by Anglo-American bombs and bayonets? Do you really believe that the voice of American conscience and Christian protest must remain silent until God and the Devil have done with the world; until Europe has been blasted into a cemetery and Western society converted into a howling wilderness, by its own monstrous violence; until there is no force left to resist the fragmentation of Europe and the advancing Russian Bear and Soviet Juggernaut—before Hitler the most unmitigated tyranny since Tamerlane? . . Have you lost your sense of proportion, or of the reality of the Balance-of-Power, or of the vision of the Christian epos?

As an example of the kind of moral protest which is so necessary, so honorable—and so rare—on the part of the educated and the intellectual leaders of society, in time of total war and loss of moral balance and of sanity, let me quote the memorable joint letter published in the *London Times* almost three years ago by George Bernard Shaw and Professor Gilbert Murray:

A Challenge to the War Lords
(Re-published in *Look,* July 29, 1941)

Prof. Gilbert Murray and I have said that whatever may be said from the military point of view for our treatment of Bremen, Hamburg, and Kiel [Cf., Cologne, Stettin, Mannheim, Frankfurt, Berlin, in 1942, 1943, 1944], there is nothing to be said for the demolition of metropolitan cities as such. We have called on our Government to approach the German Government with a view to reaching an agreement to refrain from such demolition. [How many Unitarian laymen or churchmen have done likewise?]

Our main point is that no military or moral advantage is gained by bombing cities; and that such bombardment may even be a positive disadvantage to the attacker, by stiffening the resistance of the attacked. . . . By the new method of warfare nothing is gained. Much that is irreplaceable, and treasures of culture and humanity are lost. If all the cities in British, German, Italian—and American—occupation were smashed into heaps of ruins and debris, as many of them will be at the present rate, would any of the belligerents be a day nearer a decision? All of these acts of diabolical wickedness would have done nothing but gratify at enormous cost passions which civilized nations should not permit themselves to gratify.

I do not admit the plea that the effect of bombing Berlin will be quite different from the effect of bombing London; nor that, while the bombing of London has infuriated Londoners, the bombing of Berlin would have ultimately the effect of cowing Berliners and making them yell for peace. The shortest way to disgrace and defeat is allowing tactics to be dictated by fools who talk like that.

Pointing out that "we have done our very damnedest to Berlin, and the Germans have done their very damnedest to London," Shaw then presciently noted that the effect has been, and would be, the same in both places. He said:

> Endless retaliation finally exhausts both sides. All war is demoralization. As the demand takes the shape of "Give it back to 'em; let them have a taste of their own medicine!" the flames are fanned instead of being extinguished. . . . When you hear people howling like that, you may conclude that they are not intelligent enough to listen to Gilbert Murray, or to me.

Is this not a very satisfactory answer to the merciless sophistries and Anglophile delusions of the Lord Van Sittarts and the Walter Lippmanns?

Spring Hill, Alabama. BRENT DOW ALLINSON.

Too Much Pacifism

To UNITY:

UNITY is not enough all out in the fight against the wicked enslavers and their cohorts in this and nearly every other country. Therefore I must discontinue my subscription to this time.

STERLING RUSSELL.

St. Paul, Minnesota.

◇ ◇ ◇ ◇

To UNITY:

Please cancel my subscription to UNITY. It has been an inspiration these many years, and its idealism, courage, and sincerity, as well as literary excellence, could command only the greatest admiration and respect.

But, before taking leave, I want to write you about my reaction to some of your editorials. There can be no question that if we are to have an ever better world, it must be planned on a foundation of reason and for universal good, free from hatred which devastates those that harbor it. Yet, publishing solitary acts of mercy, such as the one quoted in the March number (even if there be a hundred such, which I doubt) would only bring into relief the nameless things that are happening to this generation. Jesus himself would not feel called upon to soften the picture, knowing that a sense of horror is one of the weapons needed to overcome the hydra-headed Nazi dragon. Nazism with its Reichswehr and gestapo is an ancient disease, as old as Germany itself, and because that country has dedicated all its intellectual force and ingenuity and its very soul to military conquest and confiscation of the rest of the world, it is a good field for Armageddon and the initiation of a more enlightened era.

War is the great atrocity, to be sure, and should be rooted out at every source. More hideous and menacing than war is Nazism, and the very thought of giving comfort to its promoters is revolting. That is certainly what those will be doing, though unconsciously, who point up a chance act of mercy in the face of wholesale extermination and brutality, the like of which has never happened in all history. In the presence of this cataclysm, to dispense literature about the "generous and compassionate" Nazis who have passionately repudiated all things of the spirit in order that there might be no restraint on their savagery,—do you really believe that would be the part of wisdom and truth?

Were it not for the fine imagination and eloquence and zeal of the editor, I should not have taken the pains to protest, but he has a large following who revere his fearless devotion to his principles, and among them may be those who, bewildered and uncertain as to what course to pursue toward the enemy, would be swayed by the sentiment of their leader. In this respect and at this critical time I believe his attitude is harmful and dangerous,—in a class with the protest against bombing of German war plants. It is unrealistic and no more justifiable than would passive resistance be toward a maniac in your home when your children are threatened.

In any case there probably can be no hindering the surge of elemental justice; and when this Frankenstein is destroyed and with it the system that created it maybe we will earnestly begin the world re-education to end war for all time.

MRS. JOSEPH ROBINS.

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, 15, Illinois

92ND ANNUAL MEETINGS

This year the Conference invited the Meadville Conference to meet with them in a joint session. The Detroit Church, which entertained the Conferences, was exceptionally efficient in carrying out plans and arrangements. A total of 305 people registered.

The following churches were represented—

Western Conference:

Ann Arbor
Bloomington
Chicago—First
Chicago—Third
Chicago—People's
Chicago—People's Liberal
Cincinnati—St. John's
Dayton
Des Moines
Detroit
Davenport
Flint
Geneva
Grosse Pointe
Indianapolis
Jackson
Lawrence
Madison
Milwaukee
Minneapolis
Omaha
Quincy
Rockford
Toledo
Urbana

Meadville Conference:

Cleveland
Columbus
Erie
Marietta
Meadville
Pittsburgh

Space does not permit a full report on the various sessions. Dr. E. Burdette Backus, of Indianapolis, gave the Conference Sermon, "Responsible Freedom." Rev. Ralph E. Bailey's talk on "Freedom of Publication" will appear later in UNITY. Dr. Charles Lyttle gave a most interesting paper on "The Unitarian Contribution to the Rochdale Cooperative," which will appear in a future issue of the *Journal of Liberal Religion*. The Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice heard reports on Willow Run by Edward Redman, and what the Detroit church is doing to combat juvenile delinquency in its immediate neighborhood by Mrs. Matilda Moore. Rev. Claude Williams gave the principal talk at this session. Dr. Curtis W. Reese, Rev. Ernest Kuebler, and Rev. Randall Hilton participated in an exciting panel discussion Tuesday afternoon which resulted in a lively participation by members of the audience. The meetings were brought to a close by a banquet at which the principal address was given by Dr. Preston Bradley.

Resolutions

All resolutions presented to the Conference were passed unanimously. These dealt with:

1. Thanks and appreciation to the Detroit Church.
2. A tribute to Dr. Sydney Bruce Snow.
3. A request to General Hershey for a revision of the directive of the Selective Service Commission which would after July 1 prevent any further enrollment of young men for theological training in most Protestant Divinity Schools. Thus the Conference joined with other Protestant bodies and theological schools in objecting to this discriminatory order, which has since been changed.
4. A request to the American Unitarian Association and the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice that they set up a joint commission to survey what Unitarians are doing in the field of social action in comparison and contrast with other religious bodies such as the Methodists and Congregationalists.
5. A declaration to the effect that the editorial in the May issue of UNITY, written by Curtis W. Reese, is "the true and eloquent expression of the tradition and spirit which has characterized Unitarianism throughout its entire history, and that we dedicate ourselves to the conditions of religious advance as therein set forth." Copies of this resolution were sent to the American Unitarian Association and to the Unitarian Ministerial Union.

Officers and Board Members

President.....Curtis W. Reese
Treasurer.....Delta I. Jarrett

To 1945

Virginia Plank, St. Louis
Tracy M. Pullman, Detroit
Oswell G. Treadway, Chicago

To 1946

Ralph E. Bailey, Milwaukee
Gerald F. Weary, Bloomington
J. J. Yowell, Chicago

To 1947

Lou H. Haycock, Chicago
Harold P. Marley, Dayton
Charles E. Snyder, Davenport

To 1948

Thomas A. Harrison, Chicago
R. Lester Mondale, Kansas City
Wallace W. Robbins, Chicago

Executive Secretary—Randall S. Hilton

Conference Committees

The Board of Directors appointed the following committees for the ensuing year:

Executive Committee—Curtis W. Reese, Chairman; Randall S. Hilton, Delta I. Jarrett, Wallace W. Robbins, Oswell G. Treadway.

Committee on Subsidies—Charles E. Snyder, Chairman; Mrs. Lou Haycock, Harold P. Marley.

Religious Education Committee—Mrs. Charles H. Moran, chairman; G. Richard Kuch, Mrs. Matilda Moore.

Committee on Policy and Denominational Affairs—Raymond B. Bragg, Chairman; E. Burdette Backus, Curtis W. Reese, Preston H. Luin, Roman Hruska, Jacob Trapp.

The Executive Secretary was appointed secretary of all committees.

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS

The Board of Directors in adopting the budget made provision for the news of the conference to be published each month in UNITY. Further, the Conference is sending a copy of UNITY each month to the Minister, the President of the Board, and the President of the Alliance of each church in the Conference. Other members of churches within the Conference are eligible to subscribe to UNITY at the special rate to Conference members of $1.00. Churches desiring to have extra copies for sale may make arrangements for them by communicating with the office.

UNITY was founded in 1878 by leaders of the Western Unitarian Conference and was for many years the unofficial publication of the Conference. The Conference again welcomes the interest and cooperation of UNITY.